21)

20

23 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT PAMELA ZIMBA

Judge: Magistrate Judge Edward M. Chen

INTRODUCTION

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

17

19

20

21

23

25

26

27

1. Plaintiffs Chang and Sun's state action Christine Chang v. Eva Ammann No. 2001-023364 was concluded by a settlement of release, dismissal and order approving compromise on April 5, 2005. See Declaration of Paul A. Conroy Exhibit "G" filed on November 2, 2007.

2. Plaintiffs filed this instant action No. C-07-4005 EMC against the Defendant Pamela Zimba who made motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' first amended complaint and for a more definite statement.

LEGAL ARGUMENT

3. The Defendant Pamela Zimba owed a fiduciary duty to Plaintiffs Chang and Sun. See American Airlines, Inc. v. Sheppard, 96 Cal. App. 4th 1017. In American Airlines, plaintiff client sued defendant law firm and its attorney, and jury found defendants liable for breach of fiduciary duty and professional negligence. The plaintiff client appealed the trial court's summary adjudication of its punitive damages claim. The court of appeal held that:

(1) as a matter of law, the evidence supported the jury's finding that defendants breached their fiduciary duty to the client;

The client proved actual injury with evidence that despite its legitimate protests, the attorney persisted in representing the third party as a deposition witness. The client established as an element of its case that it suffered damages as a result of defendants' breach of fiduciary duty. The judgment and the postjudgment order awarding attorney fees to the client were affirmed.

5. See Bankers Trust Company v. Pacific Employers Insurance Company, 282 F.2d 106 (1960). After appellant obtained a judgment against appellee, it filed suit against appellee for **fraud** in the inducement, alleging that appellee misrepresented the value of the policies. The appellant challenged an order of the district court granting

2

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

summary judgment for appellee in a suit for **fraud**. The appeals court reversed the judgment holding that appellant did not make an election of remedies by obtaining the prior judgment on the policies, because a right of action on a contract and one for fraud in inducing a party to enter into such contract could exist at the same time, recovey on one of the causes did not bar a subsequent action on the other. The fraud suit was a distinct cause of action arising out of separate and distinct facts. It also held that the suit was not barred by res judicata because the causes of action were not identical. The appeals court rejected the district court's ruling that appellant waived its right to claim any amount over that recovered in the prior suit, since it did not waive a fraud by enforcing a contract which it had fully performed before discovering the **fraud**. Appellant was not estopped from filing suit as it did not mislead appellee to its injury.

- 6. In Hamilton v. Prudential Financial, 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 72034, plaintiff entered into a written contract for a long term disability insurance policy with defendant, and received total disability benefits from 1999 until 2005. In November 2005 defendant terminated his benefits despite his allegedly continuing disability. Plaintiff alleges the defendant acted despicably, willfully, wantonly, oppressively, fraudulently, or in conscious disregard of the plaintiff's rights. Plaintiff further alleges defendant acted with intent to annoy, harass or injure plaintiff and pursued an outrageous course of conduct, intentionally and recklessly, proximately causing plaintiff severe emotional distress, shock and other highly unpleasant emotions. Plaintiff claims that as a result of the defendant's conduct, plaintiff has "suffered mental and emotional distress, including, but not limited to, frustration, depression, nervousness and anxiety."
- 7. To state a claim for intentional infliction of emotional distress, plaintiff must allege: (1) outrageous conduct by defendant; (2) defendant intentionally caused or recklessly

27

9

10

11 12

13 14

15

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

23

24

25

26

27

disregarded the probability of causing emotional distress; (3) plaintiff suffered severe or extreme emotional distress; and (4) defendant's outrageous conduct was the actual and proximate cause of plaintiff's emotional distress.

- 8. The Defendant Pamela Zimba's outrageous conduct corroborating with Rockridge Manor Defendants, defense attorneys, and assault/battery Defendant Constance Celaya, to exonerate their liabilities in the assault/battery injury caused to Plaintiffs.
- 9. Plaintiffs' attorney Brett Allen inserted the Rockridge Manor Homeowners Association in the First Amended Complaint secretly against Plaintiffs' will. Plaintiffs' attorney Pamela Zimba perjured alongside the assault/battery assailant Constance Celaya who won the verdict with remedy against Plaintiffs. Pamela Zimba induced disabled Plaintiff Sun to take the stand in the assault/battery trial lying it would help Plaintiffs win the case. Pamela Zimba submitted disabled Plaintiff Sun to Defense Attorneys Sara Allman, Paul Conroy, and Chinh Vo's depositions lying that Plaintiff Sun could not claim disability but to take defense attorneys' multiple depositions. The Defendant Pamela Zimba intentionally caused and recklessly disregarded Plaintiffs emotional distress. Plaintiff Chang and especially Plaintiff Sun suffered severe and extreme emotional distress. Plaintiff Sun mutilated himself at home during those times being forced to take the stand in the assault/battery trial where Pamela Zimba and assailant Constance Celaya competing their perjury in the State Court, and being forced to take depositions by the Defense Attorneys Sara Allman, Paul Conroy, and Chinh Vo, and being mentally disabled without guardian-ad-litem filed for protection purposefully done by Pamela Zimba. Defendant Zimba's outrageous conduct was the actual and proximate cause of Plaintiffs' severe and extreme emotional distress.

CONCLUSION

8. Plaintiffs have made definite statements pursuant to FRCP Rule 12(e) with distinct causes of action: (1) Fraud; (2) Breach of attorney-client fiduciary duty; (3) Intentional infliction of emotional distress. There are genuine issues as to material fact and Plaintiffs are entitled to a jury trial.

9. Plaintiffs respectfully request that Defendant Pamela Zimba's motion to dismiss Plaintiffs' first amended complaint be defeated in its entirety, and the causes of action can be heard and determined by a jury.

DECLARATION

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Chit Chang

Christine Chang, Plaintiff

Executed on May 19, 2008, at Alameda, California.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

- I, CHRISTINE CHANG, hereby certify that on May 21, 2008, I forwarded a true and correct copy of:
- 1. Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendant Pamela Zimba's memorandum of points and authorities re motion to dismiss first amended complaint;
- 2. Memorandum of points and authorities in support of Plaintiffs' opposition to Defendant Pamela Zimba motion to dismiss first amended complaint;

to Defendants' Counsels by placing a true copy and thereof in a sealed envelope with first class postage prepaid and addressed as follows:

Gaylynn Kirn Conant Lombardi, Loper & Conant, LLP Lake Merritt Plaza 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 2600 Oakland, CA 94612-3541

Paul A. Conroy Allman & Nielsen 100 Larkspur Landing Circle Suite 212 Larkspur, CA 94939

Lee J. Danforth Coddington, Hicks & Danforth 555 Twin Dolphin Drive, Suite 300 Redwood Shores, Redwood City, California 94065-2133

Andrew Adler (faxed on 5/21) Boornazian, Jensen Garthe 555 12th Street, Suite 1800 Oakland, CA 94607

Albert F. Coombes 15915 Ventura Blvd., Penthouse 4 Encino, CA 91436

Edward Rodzewich Valvrian, Patterson and Stratman 1650 Harbor Parkway, Suite 100 Alameda, CA 94502

I caused such envelopes to be placed for collection and mailing in the United States Mail at San Francisco, California.

Dated: May 21, 2008

By Christ Chang Christine Chang, Plaintiff